UNITY

FREEDOM, FELLOWSHIP AND CHARACTER IN RELIGION

Hold the "Next War's" Peace Conference Now!
- - - - - *Harold Roland Shapiro*

The Heritage of Liberal Religion - - -
- - - - *W. Waldemar W. Argow*

Thinking with Spinoza - - - - -
- - - - - *Bernhard Mollenhauer*

Released from Bondage—Part II - - -
- - - - - *Synnove Larsen Baasch*

Study Table

VOLUME CXXII NUMBER 10

Chicago, January 16, 1939

PRICE FIFTEEN CENTS

UNITY

Established 1878

(Jenkin Lloyd Jones, Editor, 1880-1918)

Published Semi-Monthly Until Further Notice

Subscription $3.00 Single Copies 15 cents

UNITY, Abraham Lincoln Centre, 700 Oakwood Blvd., Chicago, Ill.

"Entered as Second-Class Matter May 24, 1935, at the Post Office at Chicago, Illinois, under Act of March 3, 1879."

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, *Editor* CURTIS W. REESE, *Managing Editor*

Publication Committee

MRS. S. O. LEVINSON, Chairman
MRS. E. L. LOBDELL, Vice-Chairman
MRS. IRWIN S. ROSENFELS, Treasurer
MRS. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. O. T. KNIGHT
MR. C. W. REESE
MISS MATILDA C. SCHAFF
MR. FRANCIS NEILSON
MRS. IDA S. RANDALL
MR. JAMES E. TUCKER

Editorial Contributors

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW
DOROTHY WALTON BINDER
RAYMOND B. BRAGG
TARAKNATH DAS
PERCY M. DAWSON
ALBERT C. DIEFFENBACH
JAMES A. FAIRLEY
A. EUSTACE HAYDON
JESSE H. HOLMES
LOUIS L. MANN
JOSEPH ERNEST MCAFEE
M. C. OTTO
ALSON H. ROBINSON
ROBERT C. SCHALLER
FRED W. SHORTER
CLARENCE R. SKINNER
ARTHUR L. WEATHERLY

Poetry Editors

LUCIA TRENT
RALPH CHEYNEY

Washington Correspondent

BRENT DOW ALLINSON

Foreign Representatives

AUSTRALIA—CHARLES STRONG
AUSTRIA—STEFAN ZWEIG
BULGARIA—P. M. MATTHÉEFF
ENGLAND—HARRISON BROWN
FRED HANKINSON
REGINALD REYNOLDS
FRANCE—G. DEMARTIAL
ROMAIN ROLLAND
GERMANY—THEODOR HAHN
INDIA—RABINDRANATH TAGORE
JAPAN—NOBUICHIRO IMAOKA
PALESTINE—HANS KOHN
RUSSIA—ALINA HUEBSCH

Contents

EDITORIAL—
Notes 147
Jottings—J. H. H. 150

ARTICLES—
Hold the "Next War's" Peace Conference Now!—HAROLD ROLAND SHAPIRO 150
The Heritage of Liberal Religion—W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW .. 153
ARGOW 153
Thinking with Spinoza—BERNHARD MOLLENHAUER 155
Released from Bondage—Part II—SYNNOVE LARSEN BAASCH .. 156

POETRY—
Lament for Vienna—LOUIS GINSBERG 157

STUDY TABLE—
A Tonic of Faith and Hope—CHARLES LYTTLE 158

CORRESPONDENCE—
Answering Dr. Holmes—GEORGE M. GIBSON 159
Field Article Commended—E. H. BARRETT 159
Glorifying Peace—ROSIKA SCHWIMMER 159
Degenerate Christianity—ISAAC F. BAKER 159

THE FIELD—
Gandhi on the Jews in Germany—GANDHI, in *Harijan* (India) .. 146
The Declaration of Lima 159
Community Church Campaign 160

The Field

"The world is my country, to do good is my Religion."

Gandhi on the Jews in Germany

But the German persecution of the Jews seems to have no parallel in history. The tyrants of old never went so mad as Hitler seems to have gone. And he is doing it with religious zeal. For he is propounding a new religion of exclusive and militant nationalism in the name of which any inhumanity becomes an act of humanity to be rewarded here and hereafter. The crime of an obviously mad but intrepid youth is being visited upon his whole race with unbelievable ferocity. If there ever could be a justifiable war in the name of and for humanity, a war against Germany, to prevent the wanton persecution of a whole race, would be completely justified. But I do not believe in any war. A discussion of the pros and cons of such a war is therefore outside my horizon or province.

But if there can be no war against Germany, even for such a crime as is being committed against the Jews, surely there can be no alliance with Germany. How can there be alliance between a nation which claims to stand for justice and democracy, and one which is the declared enemy of both? Or is England drifting towards armed dictatorship and all it means?

Germany is showing to the world how efficiently violence can be worked when it is not hampered by any hypocrisy or weakness masquerading as humanitarianism. It is also showing how hideous, terrible, and terrifying it looks in its nakedness.

Can the Jews resist this organized and shameless persecution? Is there a way to preserve their self-respect, and not to feel helpless, neglected, and forlorn? I submit there is. No person who has faith in a living God need feel helpless or forlorn. Jehovah of the Jews is a God more personal than the God of the Christians, the Mussulmans or the Hindus, though, as a matter of fact, in essence, He is common to all and one without a second and beyond description. But as the Jews attribute personality to God, and believe that He rules every action of theirs, they ought not to feel helpless. If I were a Jew and were born in Germany and earned my livelihood there, I would claim Germany as my home even as the tallest gentile German may, and challenge him to shoot me or cast me in the dungeon; I would refuse to be expelled or to submit to discriminating treatment. And for doing this, I should not wait for the fellow Jews to join me in civil resistance but would have confidence that in the end the rest are bound to follow my example. If one Jew or all the Jews were to accept the prescription here offered, he or they cannot be worse off than now. And suffering voluntarily undergone will bring them an inner strength and joy which no number of resolutions of sympathy passed in the world outside Germany can. Indeed, even if Britain, France,

(Continued on page 158)

UNITY

"He Hath Made of One All Nations of Men"

Volume CXXII MONDAY, JANUARY 16, 1939 No. 10

RELIGION

Religion is a mysterious and mystic impulse working within us to make us greater than we are, and the world through us better than it is; to lift us to levels above the low ranges of physical appetite and satisfaction; to drive us to goals beyond the prudential bounds of time and sense. Religion belongs distinctively to man not because he can think and speculate, build churches and rear altars, but rather because he can sense the whole of life, catch the vision of the ideal in things real, and is willing to give his life to fulfilling this vision among men. To be compelled to serve an ideal cause by a conviction of its enduring value not merely for ourselves but for humanity and its high destiny upon earth—this is religion.

JOHN HAYNES HOLMES, in
Rethinking Religion.

FRANKFURTER ON THE SUPREME BENCH

There is no way of exaggerating our enthusiasm for the President's selection of Felix Frankfurter for the Supreme Court. The appointment is in the great tradition of President Wilson's appointment of Brandeis and President Hoover's appointment of Cardozo. In this case the one lawyer in the country clearly worthy to sit in the chair of Benjamin Cardozo has been named by our Chief Executive. And let it be remembered, to Mr. Roosevelt's immortal credit, that, in making this appointment, he defied counsels of political expediency, ignored geographical considerations, and defied anti-Semitic prejudice! Felix Frankfurter is a great student and teacher of the law, as learned as he is enlightened. He is a liberal of exalted intellect and courageous spirit. His integrity and independence, together with his utter fearlessness, are proved on the one hand by his unfaltering championship of the cause of Sacco and Vanzetti, and on the other hand by his quiet but stern opposition to the President's court-packing plan. To see this man ascend the bench is to have new faith in our democracy.

THE NEW CONGRESS

Extraordinary things are appearing this early in the new Congress now in session in Washington. For one thing, this Congress has a minority party. Such a party has always been regarded as essential to democracy. Yet there was rejoicing in this country when President Roosevelt swept the land with such vast majorities in 1936 that the Republican Party was reduced to numbers so insignificant and spirit so abject in the last Congress that a minority as such practically disappeared. Opposition to such a measure as the court-packing plan, for example, had to be led by members of the President's own party. But the last election settled this one-sided business good and plenty. We have a real minority in the halls of Congress today, and we count that all to the good. Again, this Congress is apparently going to conduct its own legislative business, as enjoined by the Constitution, without dictation by the White House. For four years, now, bills have been written by the President and his advisors, and sent to the Capitol with "must" orders for passage. Sometimes representatives and senators have been allowed to come to the President's office and watch what was going on, but more frequently, as in the case of the Supreme Court measure, new laws were finished to the dotting of the last i, before any information came to House or Senate. Now all this is changed. A special despatch from Washington informs us that the President is going to let Congress write its own bills. Think of that! But Congress is reasserting in this session another prerogative—that of controlling the purse. The Constitution declares that the legislative branch of the government shall make all appropriations. In recent years, however, the Congress has simply cast huge sums of money into the hands of the Executive—four and five billions at a time!—and left him to determine its use. Such betrayal of democracy would seem to be incredible, but it was done even in the last rebellious session. But now this practice also is ended. Mr. Roosevelt will henceforth spend money as he and Congress may agree together, and as Congress itself shall in each case duly authorize. All this means quite a change in the Washington climate. We think it a healthy change.

MUSIC AND THE JEWS

That is a superb gesture from Milan—the refusal of Dr. Erich Kleiber to conduct at the famous La Scala Opera House because of the Fascist ban upon Italian Jews! Dr. Kleiber was formerly director of the Prussian State Opera and the Berlin State Opera, but withdrew when the Nazis took over the cultural as well as

the political life of Germany. Now he finds himself in a somewhat similar situation in Italy, and acts as promptly and decisively. In accordance with the new anti-Semitism of Mussolini's fief, Jews have been banned from the Opera. Even those in Milan who had subscribed for the current season have been asked to turn in their tickets. To Dr. Kleiber this is nonsense—worse, it is a crime!—music is a universal art, is his insistence. It is like a thing of nature—a phase of creative life which belongs to all. Access to this source of comfort and inspiration must therefore not be denied. To shut off music from the soul is like shutting off air or food from the body. It is a form of murder—and Dr. Kleiber will have nothing to do with it. So he has resigned for what the authorities call "absurd racial motives"—and the atmosphere of the world is by that much cleaner and more fragrant. Such an episode reminds us once again of the devastation wrought by the Fascist and Nazi invasions of Europe. Every country which they touch becomes upon the instant a cultural desert. Think of the plight of the universities, the opera houses, the educational and art societies, the churches, and the whole world of literature! What distinguished man in any field of creative achievement has commerce with the dictators? What great novels, or dramas, or paintings, or symphonies are being produced in either Germany or Italy? What shining name of genius radiates to the world the glory of these lands? In nothing is the barbarian or horde character of the Fascist forces so apparent as in the fact that what is happening in their trail is exactly what formerly happened in the trail of the Huns and Tartars. The landscape is swept clean of all things of beauty, and of all the higher works of man. Though Fascism and Naziism were ended tomorrow, it would take a century to recover what they have cost mankind.

CONTROL OF THE PRESS

There was a time when we used to talk about government control as a remedy for the abuses of the public press. Those were the days when Hearst was running rampant, and memories of his part in bringing on the Spanish-American War were still vivid. The privately-owned press, so it was argued, was essentially irresponsible. In the field of foreign affairs its influence was especially dangerous, as large profits sprang from war scares and other excitements across the seas. If peace was to be maintained, and good feeling reign, then government must be enabled in some way to exert its moderating control. This seemed a plausible argument, and suited many of us to whom government control was a form of Socialism then popular among radicals. But now! well, things have happened. We have a government-controlled press these days in Germany, and Italy, and Japan, and Russia, and look what it is doing to us! Scarcely a day passes but what some vile abuse is poured out by the Fascist journals upon the democratic peoples. In Germany, the newspapers unite in a chorus of vulgar ridicule of Mr. Baldwin and other statesmen high in the public esteem of Britain, and straightway Mr. Chamberlain's policy of appeasement becomes difficult, if not impossible. In Italy, quite without warning, Mussolini's "kept" press shouts a united demand upon France for the surrender of Tunisia, Corsica, and Savoy, and war between Italy and France becomes a universal subject of debate. In Japan, according to a despatch in the New York *Times*, "Tokyo Press Calls U. S. Tool of Britain. Ousting of Latter from Asia Is Demanded." If there is any weapon more powerful in the hands of the totalitarian states at this hour than the newspapers, we do not happen to know what it is. And if there is any other one thing more menacing to the peace and order of the world, we are again ignorant as to its identity. Among other lessons perfectly learned in recent years is this necessity of a free press, with all its faults, to the health and happiness, indeed the very life, of democracy. Let the governments keep "hands off"!

A MONUMENT TO "CIVILIZATION"

At Rollins College in Winter Park, Florida, there was dedicated on last Armistice Day a monument which should be celebrated throughout this nation and the world. The New York *Herald-Tribune* calls it a "cynical monument." We choose to regard it, as we believe its founders regarded it, as a monument of utmost seriousness in commemoration of an idea of utmost importance. The monument is simple, consisting only of a huge bombing shell, reared on a marble pedestal. What is impressive is the inscription affixed to the face of the pedestal and beneath the shell. This inscription, written by Hamilton Holt, President of Rollins College, reads as follows:

Pause, Passer-By
and
Hang Your Head in Shame

This Engine of Destruction, Torture and Death Symbolizes
The Prostitution of the Inventor
The Avarice of the Manufacturer
The Blood-Guilt of the Statesman
The Savagery of the Soldier
The Perverted Patriotism of the Citizen
The Debasement of the Human Race

That It Can Be Employed
As an Instrument in Defense of
Liberty, Justice and Right
In Nowise Invalidates
The Truth of the Words Here Graven

This inscription needs no amplification or interpretation. It speaks for itself! It reveals, as by a lightning

flash of inspiration, the uses to which all war monuments might well be put. Thus, if replicas of this inscription could be affixed to all the cannon which now adorn village greens and city parks in various parts of the country, these cannon would suddenly be serving a useful rather than a shameful purpose. An adaptation of the inscription might well be applied to the battle-flag collections which may be found in all statehouses these days. And always there is the grave of the Unknown Soldier—that needs words of just this kind to be redeemed from the paganism which now pollutes it as an altar of devotion!

WHAT'S BECOMING OF THE CHURCHES?

Christmas day, 1938, fell on a Sunday. One would naturally think that this was a happy coincidence, for Christmas is above all a holy day, and what is more fitting than that it should come precisely on the Sabbath? But not many clergymen thought of it in this way. On the contrary, as by a common instinct, they found themselves appalled at the prospect. For what chance was there of anybody coming to church on Christmas morning? One large church, of which we chance to know, gave up altogether, and solemnly announced that all services would be suspended on Christmas Sunday, so that the sacred celebration of the day might be held at home. Another great city church abandoned its regular Sunday morning service, and substituted therefor a modest meeting for the few who might care to come to the parish house. Most ministers stiffened their backs, and resolved to make a fight for it; and to this end prepared unusually elaborate services which they hoped might make unusual appeal. Results in these cases were rather pitiful. Great music attracted some afternoon and evening crowds—the newspaper published their boiler-plate blurbs about sanctuaries thronged with worshippers. But most churches had only scattered men and women in empty pews. What we see in this queer episode is one more evidence of the thrusting aside of the churches by increasing public indifference and neglect. We have come to the time when churches as a whole are attended only when there is nothing else imaginable to do. Fair weather, foul weather, a Saturday night-club party, a week-end excursion, guests to dinner, a lazy morning with the newspapers, a game of golf—any old thing will serve as an excuse for not coming to church. As for Christmas, which used to bring people to church in happy throngs, the slump began some years ago with a commercialization of this holy day which marks one of the major social scandals of modern times. Christmas is now an occasion not for pious rejoicings in the churches, or innocent pleasures in the home, but for buying and selling in the interest of an upcurve in department-store business. It is at such times, and under such provocation, that we yearn for the return of medievalism before the baleful dawn of the industrial age.

ZONA GALE

The death of Zona Gale, famous novelist and playwright, and ardent political reformer, is a great loss to Unity, which she served through many years as Contributing Editor. Her connection with this paper began in her friendship with Jenkin Lloyd Jones, and continued after his death as a glad service in his memory and for the sake of the ideas and ideals for which he stood. Many of her best essays and sketches appeared in these columns. Here was seen in its very essence those subtle spiritual readings of life which pervaded like an atmosphere her greater work in the literary field. No one could hope to understand Zona Gale or her writings who did not have acquaintanceship with this inner religious aspect of her nature. In our contemporary American literature she was a figure of eminent and unique distinction. She began her activities as a newspaper reporter in New York, and in those years of her youthful apprenticeship was known as "the prettiest reporter in the city." Her earliest writings were conventional pieces about New York life, conceived in a familiar romantic vein. Her real achievements began with her return to her home-town, Portage (Wisconsin), and her conscious development of the native human resources of mid-western village life. From her early romanticism she moved to a so-called realism which was as different from the realism of the current schools as sunshine is from mud. It was in this later style, in novels and short stories, that she wrought her greatest success, and in such books as *Birth, Miss Lulu Bett,* and *Preface to Life* made permanent contributions to American literature. Never content to dwell in an ivory tower, or a prairie village, apart from life, Miss Gale became a leader in the progressive politics and social advance of her native state. A stout friend of the elder La Follette, she stood in the van in many a good fight for the public welfare. A woman of delicate grace and charm, soft-voiced, exquisite, refined, she had a stalwart courage and a true democratic spirit. Her interest in students, in young literary aspirants, in youth in general, was intense. Her concern for culture and the nobler things of life was always active and militant. Deeply and widely beloved, she is now grievously mourned. Alas, that she is gone!

OTHER FAMOUS DEAD OF 1938

The famous dead of 1938 who passed away since we compiled our necrology list as published in the last issue of Unity are: Helen Gould (Mrs. Finley J. Shepard), churchwoman and philanthropist; Robert Herrick, novelist; Karel Capek, the Czechoslovakian playwright who added the word "robot" to our language; Zona Gale, novelist and playwright, and a Contributing Editor of this paper; James Sexton, English Laborite, Emile Vandervelde, European Socialist leader, and our own beloved Sydney Strong, Congregational clergyman and long a contributor to Unity.

Jottings

Philadelphia proposes to get out of debt by selling Independence Hall to the federal government. But why bother with the federal government? Why not put the silly old relic on the auction-block, and sell it to the highest bidder?

Slowly but surely we are conquering this lynching business. Last year (1938) there were only six lynchings, all of Negroes, as compared with eight each in 1937 and 1936, and twenty in 1935. Of these six lynchings, three were in one state, Mississippi. Georgia, of course, appears on the list of offending states, and also Florida and Louisiana. The monster is being cornered; he will soon be slain.

Listening to a synagogue service on the radio the other night, we found ourselves wondering if we had ever heard a major chord in Jewish music. The harmonies are prevailingly in the minor—for a reason that marks the whole span of Christian history!

Nazi Germany is dissatisfied with the production of eggs in the Reich, and has decreed henceforth an annual quota of 140 eggs per hen. Hitler, in other words, expects every rooster to do his duty!

With his unusual sense of the true fitness of things, Generalissimo Franco launched his great drive against the Loyalists in Spain during the Christmas holidays. We doubt if war is any worse on the birthnight of the Christ than at other times. But it seems so!

J. H. H.

Hold the "Next War's" Peace Conference Now!

HAROLD ROLAND SHAPIRO*

Twenty years after a shell-shocked world obtained surcease from a war to "make the world safe for democracy," we watch the gathering storm clouds as nations prepare feverishly for war. This time, as Colonel P. S. Bond promised our last World War army, "we will start right, from the beginning, and it will be a wonderful fight."

In the next war, the armies of the world will undoubtedly profit from the costly experiences of the World War, as well as of the lesser wars of the past few years. But new and unheard of weapons of destruction will probably upset the carefully-drawn calculations of our next World War army. In only one branch of the service will it be possible to take over bodily the equipment evolved during the last war: the war propaganda machine, headed by the President of the United States.

It would be a waste of time and energy, unforgivable under the stress of war conditions, for our next War-President to prepare new speeches with which to exhort our young men to sacrifice themselves, when so many of President Wilson's inimitable messages urging us to fight the last war, apply—without having to cross a "t" or dot an "i"—to this year of grace. In an age of ghost-writers, what living man's word could compare with the ever-available ghost of Woodrow Wilson, speaking eloquently to us from his collected war speeches?

Today, as in 1917, democratic countries which fear the impending holocaust, are playing upon our democratic sympathies to help "make the world safe for democracy" again. Already we are being reminded that neutrality is a pitfall; that "the right is more precious than peace." Were the Commander-in-Chief of the Army and Navy of the United States to call upon Congress again to declare war, he need merely repeat the following words of Woodrow Wilson in 1917:

> Neutrality is no longer feasible or desirable where the peace of the world is involved and the freedom of its peoples, and the menace to that peace and freedom lies in the existence of autocratic governments backed by organized force which is controlled wholly by their will, not by the will of their people. . . . Any body of free men that compounds with the present German Government is compounding for its own destruction. . . . What I am opposed to is not the feeling of the pacifists, but their stupidity. My heart is with them, but my mind has contempt for them. I want peace, but I know how to get it and they don't.

Should words like these arouse the nation once again to make the world safe for democracy, the President, whoever he might be at that future time, could find no language more appropriate and moving than the following, in which Woodrow Wilson in 1917 caused his Secretary of State to advise the Pope that America, at war, was unable to accept the Papal offer to mediate Peace:

> It is not a mere cessation of arms he [the President] desires; it is a stable and enduring peace. . . . Responsible statesmen must now everywhere see, if they never saw before, that no peace can rest securely upon political or economic restrictions meant to benefit some nations and cripple or embarrass others, upon vindictive action of any sort, or any kind of revenge or deliberate injury. . . . The test, therefore, of every plan of peace is this: Is it based upon the faith of all the people involved . . . ? Punitive damages, the dismemberment of empires, the establishment of selfish and exclusive economic leagues, we deem inexpedient and in the end worse than futile, no proper basis for a peace of any kind, least of all for an enduring peace. That must be based upon justice and fairness and the common rights of mankind.

Then some day the next war must end and, although all the world will be prostrate, one group of allied powers will again possess the victors' prerogative to dictate to another group of defeated allied powers the

*Assistant Professor of Law, New York Law School; author of *What Every Young Man Should Know About War.*

terms of peace. Yet, although we "start right, from the beginning, and it will be a wonderful fight," unless we start our peace negotiations "right, from the beginning," all our terrific sacrifice in the next war will again have gone for nought. For there will be no enduring peace after the next war, as there is no enduring peace now despite the high-minded assurances of 1917-18, unless the delegates to the Peace Conference *after the next war* achieve a treaty that will not suffer from the deficiencies of the unfortunate 1919 Treaty of Versailles.

Wilson prophesied truly during the last war when he said regarding the military masters under whom Germany was bleeding:

> If they fail, their people will thrust them aside; a government accountable to the people themselves will be set up in Germany as it has been in England, in the United States, in France, and in all the great countries of modern time except Germany . . . and the world will be at peace.

The autocrats of wartime Germany did fail, and their people did thrust them aside. But the eventual return of Germany's military masters could be foreseen when the allied plenipotentiaries at Versailles dictated to the people of Germany a vindictive peace. Nevertheless, the key to a later peaceful revision of the treaty, as well as to the voluntary, continued disarmament of Germany, was contained in the expectation that the League of Nations covenant would be adopted universally. But our own Senate rejected that covenant, thereby making universality impossible. The League never got a chance!

Consequently, when Hitler's Nazis assumed power in Germany by capitalizing on the mistakes of the Versailles *Diktat*—as the Germans have always called that treaty—and on the short-sightedness of the American Senate, the second part of Wilson's prophecy was eventually fulfilled:

> If they succeed, America will fall within the menace. We and all the rest of the world must remain armed, as they will remain, and must make ready for the next step in their aggression. . . .

Therefore, should the next war result in the end of dictatorship in Germany—instead of the equally possible end of democratic governments everywhere—the triumph of democracy would not necessarily endure, any longer than it did after the last war, unless the victors at the next peace conference redeem Wilson's unfulfilled pledge of 1917 when he declared, "I cannot say too often to any audience, we are fighting a thing, not a people."

Another Wilson observation during the last war would have to be accepted not only as part of the next war's propaganda of hate, but as a realistic approach in the peace conference after the war: that the most extraordinary fact of modern history is the way in which the German people "have accepted their thinking from authority as well as their action from authority." This estimate of the German masses by Wilson explains why Hitler was able so easily to lure peace treaty-shocked Germans to forsake their democratic form of government. Consequently, the peace treaty after the next war (assuming that the German people would revolt again and set up a democracy!) must so combine charity with vision, that authoritarian demagogues would be unable again to lure this exhausted people to backslide into their habit of enslavement to authority.

If we would prepare ourselves as well for negotiating the peace as for conducting the war, we should see to it that not again would the Peace Conference be delayed in getting under way by confusion as to method, procedure, and lack of a well-defined program laid out in advance. No more would a defeated nation have cause to blame the wasted, life-throttling months of delay between the armistice and the peace with causing the death of hundreds of thousands of its women and children. The whole world, years after the war, would not be made to suffer once again by reason of the consequent failure to resume normal conditions as soon as possible after the cessation of hostilities.

To avoid the mistakes that were made before the last peace conference, the experts engaged by each country to assemble the geographical, strategic, historical, and ethnographical data for the Peace Conference after the next war, would have to be better prepared and more competent than in 1919 to perform their all-important task. They would be better coördinated and more coöperative among themselves. The plan they proposed for the conference would be a fully-matured and realistic one, made in consultation with their country's delegates, since the delegates, after all, will be expected to use it. The experts themselves, in their preparations, would make full use of existing war organizations instead of improvising independent ramshackle bureaus unconnected with the actual problems of the war, and the plans of the experts of each country would be discussed with the principal statesmen and adapted to the needs of all the allies in advance.

In point of fact, however, when the Peace Conference after the next war is ended, a future historian will probably write, as Temperley has done regarding the preparations for the last one:

> The principal statesmen had no leisure to work out the organization of a Conference of Peace, and, if they had had the leisure, they would have shrunk from raising problems which might have divided them in the face of a still-unbeaten enemy.

But since it will probably be impossible to develop Peace Conference plans and data during the stress of battle, an ordinary person might very well ask, why must the statesmen wait until their countries are at war, before doing the preparatory work for the Peace Conference? Why not establish our expert commissions for the Peace Conference after the next war *now*, when we are comparatively sane and still at peace? And why not invite all the nations that will doubtless participate in the next war, to contribute permanent experts who will find the facts concerning the numerous foreseeable problems that are bound to come up for discussion at the next World War Peace Conference? If nations expect to be enemies some day, because they do not see eye to eye, better to make their two or more sets of findings of fact now than to cripple the peace after the next war by providing the Peace Conference delegates with half-baked findings made during hostilities. Under any circumstances, is there any sensible reason why they cannot lay down the "sporting" rules for the Peace Conference negotiations after the next war *now*?

Suppose, then, that the Peace Conference after the next war were blessed by adequate preparations! Avoiding the mistakes of the last war's peace preliminaries, the armistice agreement next time would obviously not be based upon the vague political speeches of the head of one of the victor-states, as the last one was based on the political utterances of Woodrow Wilson. This

time, proper preliminaries would be drawn; a proper armistice would be framed. The conference itself still would be subject to failure unless, unlike the last one, it were held in some neutral spot where the delegates of the victor and vanquished nations could sit (with adequate intervals of rest and sleep!) for as long a time as necessary to achieve a just and lasting peace, without being subjected to the heart-thumping, nerve-racking, brain-dulling pressure of a bloodthirsty and impatient victor-population.

Once the conference were begun, instead of the unusual and unwise procedure of the last Peace Conference, where every transaction was conducted in writing between the allied and German delegates, there would have to be that healthful, oral interchange of viewpoint and clarification of the proposed peace terms between the parties, which is implicit in the term "conference."

Can we expect, however, that the passion aroused by a frightful war, which made such face-to-face negotiations impossible after the last war, will not likewise preclude a just peace after the next war? Is it reasonable to suppose that the rival powers will be less passionately anxious to end hostilities than they were in November, 1918?—that unlike 1918, next time they will wait until proper peace preliminaries are drawn, or a proper armistice framed?

Of course, miracles may happen. If so, the leaders of the Peace Conference after the next war, unlike those of the last conference, will not only come provided with far-reaching schemes of settlement; they will adequately consult the diplomats attached to their own delegations who understand the technique of conferences; they will not choose from the mass of expert data available to them only those facts and figures which will buttress their own *a priori* views; they will not heed the advice of their own experts only in so far as suits their whim. Next time, they will give ample opportunity to all parties to offer suggestions and defend their claims.

Granted, however, that the plenipotentiaries at the next Peace Conference should possess these almost impossible qualifications, would they not be bound again to respect preëxisting treaties and other obligations, entered into under the stress of war by one or more of the victors, thereby hindering the application of such intelligible methods, forms of proceeding and principles of deliberation as might be agreed upon in advance? At the last Peace Conference, vital differences arose among the Great Powers as to commercial policy, law, reparations, and military service. Is there any reason to expect that these will be less acute at the next peace conference? Although there may be little time for sleep in wartime, war, like politics, makes strange bedfellows. Is it not reasonable to expect that the differences that arose last time will be complicated further by the probability that not all the allies on either side will represent the same ideology of government? And is there any less likelihood than at the Versailles Peace Conference that attempts will be made in this unfit, intemperate atmosphere to dispose of matters needing scientific and impartial treatment?

This time, of course, the delegates of the defeated enemy will not aggravate matters by being as bold in facing the dictators of the peace as Germany's Brockdorff-Rantzau felt he had to be in 1919. They will not again make the fatal mistake of attacking each clause in the treaty with equal fervor, instead of concentrating on its most vulnerable portions; (thereby consolidating all the specialists on the victorious side against them and sacrificing political wisdom to the pride of authorship). Of course, a clever diplomat of a country defeated in the next war could well profit by the mistake of the German delegation at Versailles, and sow the seeds of future conflict among the victors themselves by taking advantage of and aggravating differences among them.

All of which promises, once again, after the next war, a treaty of compromises and ambiguities, which, far from providing a permanent solution of the causes of war, will perpetuate vital differences and make still another carnage inevitable. Nor is there prospect that the demand for revenge aroused by the hatred and indignation of victorious populations will lead any less, than "Make Germany Pay" did in 1919, to the exaction of impracticable demands (containing the seeds of future wars) from the reluctant and helpless vanquished.

What guaranty have we that the negotiators of the victorious powers will not again be so helpless in the grip of the public as to respond to popular clamor by once more imposing treaty conditions violating promises made to our enemies? Or that they will not again endeavor to "justify" a vindictive position by inserting a suicidal "war guilt" clause, despite the wise and necessary principle of peace treaties, as expressed by Vattel:

> In such conventions no decision is pronounced on the original cause of the war, or on those controversies to which the various acts of hostility might give rise; nor is either of the parties condemned as unjust—a condemnation to which few princes would submit. . . .

If so, will not the world suffer once again the bitter consequences of pandering to the vengeful outcries of the unhappy survivors of the war, who wield the power of the ballot at home? It begs the question to say that the popular passion, which makes a permanent peace settlement impossible after a war, was aroused as a part of the will to win by the statesmen themselves during the war. To quote from Temperley:

> But today the dangerous and subtly intoxicating influences of war-propaganda have marred the prospects of peace settlements and still continue to trouble the waters of diplomacy. As it is now, statesmen are first the inspirers, and ultimately the victims, of their own propaganda. A healthy and sane public opinion on foreign policy can only arise today if statesmen resolutely apply themselves to instructing and not to inciting their public.

On the other hand, is there any reason to expect, after all our horrible sacrifices of heart, soul, body, and means in another war, that our confidence in our delegates may not again be so undermined by the dispatches from our irritated, news-starved correspondents at a conference where secrecy is vital, that once more a steadygoing cry may go forth from the war's survivors in the United States to end the conference, bring our people back, and have it done with?

If this is the inevitable fate of peace conferences after all the expenditure in money, property, and blood, regardless of our best intentions and preparations—leaving a painfully denuded world subject to reinfection from the virus of a smouldering resentment—why not hold our Peace Conference *before* any "next war?"

There are, of course, difficulties in the way of a final settlement of issues in peacetime. Usually there is lacking the terrific pressure of war-weary populations demanding an immediate peace. The normal diffi-

culties of peace time conferences are these: "One state finds its salvation in infinite delay, another in evasion of a crucial issue, a third in flat negation." But this need not be the result where the agenda are limited, the objects are precise, and there is sufficient popular pressure in the form of a tremendous WILL TO PEACE.

Lloyd George has stated that the World War which began in August, 1914, could have been avoided had the Great Powers got around a council table in July, 1914. The populations of the world, including the leaders of totalitarian states, are today fearfully aware of the keg of dynamite on which all of us are sitting; of the certain defeat of victor as well as vanquished by another World War, and of the urgency of avoiding the impending danger. Because we violently hate each others' political systems, must we continue to remain transfixed like fear-stricken felines while we behold a war rumbling toward us that would mean destruction for all? If the sins of the Fathers of the Versailles Treaty have been visited upon the children of today, must the retribution continue "to the third and fourth generations?" Because there was no revision, clause after clause of that treaty has perished at the hands of Hitler. That is an accomplished fact. To the mind of a once-humiliated and presently-desperate Germany, and an equally desperate Italy, the League of Nations as a creature of that treaty has reinsured the conquests and annexations of England and France. Nazis, Fascists, and the war lords of Japan alike condemn the League as the defender of an unhealthy *status quo* in a dynamic world.

If our purpose is to remove the causes of the war that threatens, we must accept this mental state of Germany, Italy, and Japan as a reality—as real as their hatred of democracy and our hatred of dictatorships. We must realize that just as in the last war the allies fought on the side of the autocratic Czar of Russia, so military necessity may find the democracies fighting in the next war on the same side as another dictatorship—the "dictatorship of the proletariat" under Stalin—whom some Americans now detest quite as vigorously as they abhor the Nazis, Fascists, and the Japanese militarists. Rigidity, which is thus rejected in the exigencies of wartime, and which in peacetime emergencies would be fatal to the constitutional structure of a democratic people, must be rejected as a continuing principle of the peace-treaty structure in a world of maladjusted international relationships, as being historically, economically, and psychologically suicidal. Fortunately, the principle of flexibility was admitted into the treaty-revision paragraph of the League Covenant. But there it exists in suspended animation—ineffectual because (1) the Covenant still is considered part of the "hated" Versailles Treaty, and (2) the machinery of the League Assembly which must invoke the treaty-revision procedure is ill-fitted for delicate negotiation which involves the honor and dignity of sovereign states. But since the principle of treaty-revision thus stands admitted, it remains to apply it in *intimate* peace negotiations, organized on a basis of equality, and based on those cardinal requirements of decency and common sense which vanish whenever the world's atmosphere has been poisoned by "victor" and "vanquished."

Let us, therefore, *try* to save ourselves from the indescribable, unpredictable series of horrors and ravages which will constitute the next World War,—and from the peace imposed after the next war that would have to be undone by still another war—by prevailing upon the world to awaken from its stupor and hold our Peace Conference *now*, before the next war causes judgment again to become brutish and men to lose their reason.

The Heritage of Liberal Religion*

W. WALDEMAR W. ARGOW

I would be unfaithful to my trust, if I did not, on this day of high remembrance, seek to make vivid to your hearts what it was that our founding fathers felt was the supreme fact about life itself. For them this church was something vastly more than a mere protest society against certain theological dogmas which were current in their day. They had an insight into the nature of reality which was born out of a divine convulsion in their souls, and which they felt was absolutely essential for the outworking of civilization as begun in America. Their religion was inseparably bound up with their philosophy of life; of the rights and place of the individual; of the purpose and scope of the state; and of the ultimate power by which man could and would work out his destiny upon this terrestrial ball. For them these fundamentals were as basic to human nature as the multiplication table, the law of gravitation, and the tidal forces that swell the ocean. Without their enthronement in the mind and soul of man, and then in their outworking of human affairs, man would sink back again into the mire of animality from which he had climbed at great cost.

Grant me now the privilege of recounting the inheritance which is enshrined in this philosophy of life which they have bequeathed unto us.

They held these truths to be axiomatic and self-evident, validated by a kind of instinctive intellectual apperception, namely, the sacredness of the individual who in and of himself possessed certain specific absolute rights which God has given him, and which could not be taken from him without doing violence to him as a person. They maintained that no group of men, whether that group be the state or society, had by reason of its superiority in power and number given the individual his rights, and therefore could not abrogate them. Among these rights was the right to think the thoughts he wished, and then to express them as he wished; the right to shape his life as to him seemed best, provided that in so doing he left others free to do the same; the right to associate himself with others into any kind of government, society, or organization he chose, to promote his and their well-being.

*Excerpts from an Anniversary Sermon delivered on the occasion of the Centennial Celebration of May Memorial Church (Unitarian), Syracuse, N. Y.—*Editors.*

Thus, our fathers held that liberty was as essential to the survival of man upon the earth, as were food and water for the survival of his body. They contended that the only authority to which the individual was finally responsible was the authority, not of the state, a Book, a Council, a society, but of truth; and this truth was to be arrived at through the exercise of free discussion and free investigation. They insisted that religion was man's quest of the highest as the individual conceived the highest, and was not therefore to find its sanctions in a body of traditions, a set of dogmas, or an ecclesiastical council. For them man's great quest was the achievement of individuality, and the coöperation of man with man was the medium for its realization.

Moreover, they insisted upon the trustworthiness of the human mind as capable of solving its problems, however perplexing and stupendous they might be. It was for this reason that they placed such complete reliance upon a free press, free assembly, free speech, and academic freedom, knowing that when intellectually honest minds foregather for a solution of their problems, there the highest good would emerge. To that end they insisted upon the individual's responsibility to help and be helped by others within the pattern of this individual freedom. For them the verdict of history was that man had come to be what he was only as he overcame obstacles and assumed responsibility for the intelligent direction of his own destiny. To achieve this they placed wholehearted reliance upon truth as the only power of might which would in the long run be the final arbiter. The swirling sands of history had revealed to them that whatever may be at the heart of life, truth at least is there, and that truth, apprehended by man's free exercise of the mind, would at long last bring him to his highest estate.

Furthermore, they contended that the purpose of human life was not to preserve or glorify the state as a superior entity, greater than himself; not to maintain or enhance this nebulous thing called society, but to unfold and to realize the potentialities that lay dormant within each person. They had no illusions about the inequality existing between persons, and that therefore it would be folly to level the highest down to the level of the lowest, or even try to raise the lowest to the level of the highest. Yet despite this they held to a vigorous trusteeship of every person to help every other person to realize his or her potentialities. Duty was for them the essence of the moral law. It was, therefore, the duty of every person to help every other person to help himself become all that he was capable of becoming. And this was to be done within the pattern of liberty. Never did they conceive of liberty as an absence of restraint, allowing the individual to pursue his own selfish way; nor on the other hand did they think of liberty as certain concessions granted them by the state or society. On the contrary, for them liberty was the medium in which, through the exercise of self-imposed disciplines, the individual was to win his liberation from the limitations of his undeveloped nature. To put it graphically, liberty was to be like the wide-open reaches of the air in which the bird was to exercise the power of flight through the disciplined use of his wings. They never conceived of the state or society as owing them anything whatsoever. Contrariwise, they held that every man owed every other man everything. They talked less of what society owed them, and more of what they owed society. Free men are debtors one to another and not pensioners of society or the state.

Again, they contended that the achievements of the individual's hands, talents, and genius were as sacred as his own being, and that these were not to be destroyed by violence or confiscated by a process known as law. To be sure, since this work of his hands, of necessity, involved the labor and efforts of others besides himself, a portion of it should be used to maintain the mutual process we call societal organization. True, wealth was in part of social origin, but only insofar as it was produced by individual persons. An impersonal mass of "social" bricks never fashioned themselves into a building. Therefore, no matter how intricate society may become in its relationships, the unit of it will forever be the individual. Destroy him and you destroy society. A hundred worthless pennies can never make a worthful dollar.

Therefore, above all else, they contended that man the individual was before any form of social organization or government existed; that he is greater than the state or even society, and that he did not enter society to become less than he was. Society and the state receive their worth from the individual; the individual does not receive his worth from them. Since therefore he was prior to the state, the state can, and even may be destroyed without in any way affecting the essential spiritual genius of man the individual. If man's first concern had been security, he would never have left the safe confines of the jungles and embarked upon the perilous venture of spiritual emancipation. If, therefore, the supreme function of the state or society is to provide security, and man makes this his chief concern, then indeed is he doomed to a return to the jungle from which he climbed at great cost.

When our fathers declared these truths as the very substance of life itself, the world was just beginning to evolve out of spiritual darkness, and to seek for the light. It was their fond hope that gradually through the exercise of this native liberty, all the world would at length be led to their acceptance, and man the individual would ascend from glory to glory. They believed that a coming dawn would fret the inky darkness until the vigil stars would change from evening to morning stars. But a day has come when we face not an evolution towards a higher concept of life and its ascending glory but a reversion to an existence wherein the individual, and with him his fellows, will move steadily backward and downward into an animality from which he has slowly emerged. Today we face not an ignorant world as our fathers did, but an arrogant, antagonistic world, one that has tasted the sweetness of a growing liberty, and now has decided to eat the bitter fruits of spiritual decadence. Our fathers fought an offensive battle; we must fight a defensive battle, taking our last stand on the issue as to whether man is first a body that has a mind, or whether he is a spiritual entity

that uses a body. On the outcome of these issues hangs the fate of what we call civilization.

It ought to be evident that liberal religion, with its uncompromising declaration of the inherent rights of the individual as the most precious of all realities, becomes for us today the very lifeblood which alone can make human survival possible. To support and proclaim it henceforth is no longer an optional matter, nor one of sentimental preference. Indeed, it now becomes a challenging crusade greater than any which man ever faced since the day when the first individual felt a divine irritation in his breast urging him to part company with the beasts. This day calls for a greater heroism than that of our fathers. It demands an intellectual discipline, a moral discernment, and a spiritual sensitiveness which they never knew. Our heritage is great; so great that we must risk our all to keep it inviolable. That we can do it, and that we are equal to it, I doubt not at all; for in our veins flows the blood of an heroic race which builded better than it KNEW.

Thinking with Spinoza

BERNHARD MOLLENHAUER

"Great geniuses," says Emerson, "have the shortest biographies." The biography of Spinoza is short; he died at the age of forty-four, and his life was outwardly not spectacular. Yet in a way his remarkable career epitomizes so much of the wonderful and strange Odyssey of the Jews. We little realize the deep inwardness, the vast endurance, the patience, the tragedy, and the loneliness of this man.

Benedict Spinoza was born in the Ghetto of Amsterdam, in 1632. While still a boy he became aware of the contrast between the narrow schooling of the synagogue and the liberal culture around him. His interest in the new learning of Europe found no favor with his strict and cautious elders. His student days were hardly over before they asked him to recant certain of his views which had become known to them. Finding him unmoved by their promises and threats, they cut him off from his people, a severe sentence in those days. Spinoza accepted his ostracism and persecution with quiet resignation. He was too well-balanced to become an embittered radical, and managed to preserve his mental health under seemingly impossible conditions. He found all society for a time against him and heard no friendly voice except that of his Latin teacher, Van den Ende, who was himself under suspicion of heresy. And so Spinoza took refuge in the trade of lensmaking. Heine says, "All our modern philosophers, though often perhaps unconsciously, see through the glasses which Spinoza ground."

The philosophy of Spinoza has some points in common with contemporary Humanism. It stresses human values and banishes all things supernatural and occult. Spinoza's emphasis on the unity of God and Nature does not debase God but elevates nature. Three centuries of science have made it easier for us to grasp the God-idea of Spinoza. Perhaps the best introduction to the philosophy of Spinoza is his short treatise *On the Improvement of the Understanding*. It is his voyage of discovery, beginning with an account of his search for truth and the way to lasting happiness. We see here that Spinoza was no ascetic who scorned the refinements of life and saw nothing but vanity in the ways of the world; his nature was too strong to need the stimulant of pessimism. There is no posing in his confession that he believed the exclusive pursuit of worldly pleasures and titles is vain and futile. It is the frankest confession in the world. He knew what it was to have a secure position in society and what it meant to walk on the outer wastes of spiritual darkness, poverty, and failure. More than once he refused tempting offers of gain and worldly recognition, because he loved his hard-won independence. He believed the pursuit of truth our greatest adventure, for to understand the world, to be in it and yet not of it, is to inwardly possess it. When a man sees life from that point of view he can have no desire to exploit his fellow men. He is more concerned with a new criterion of values, and finds happiness in service rather than in being served. Spinoza believed that all science should be inspired by an ideal of human freedom and the "intellectual love of God."

Discrimination between the real and the unreal, and the ideal of a human character more stable and perfect than our own, turn us in the direction of a higher level of experience. Yet the goal is far off. While we are endeavoring to bring the mind into the right path, we may lay down provisional rules of conduct. When setting out on his quest for truth as a young man, Spinoza made three rules for himself.

> To speak in a manner comprehensible to the people, and to do for them all things that do not prevent us from attaining our ends. . . .
>
> To enjoy only such pleasures as are necessary for the preservation of health. . . .
>
> Finally, to seek only enough money . . . as is necessary for the maintenance of our life and health, and to comply with such customs as are not opposed to what we seek.
>
> —*On the Improvement of the Understanding.*

Spinoza associated the degrees of knowledge and understanding with the several stages of moral progress. At the lowest stage of thought man is without any conception of natural law and is a creature of circumstance, swayed by superstitious fears. His knowledge is not above the level of hearsay evidence and opinions formed from chance observations, more often from fanciful traditions. Life is passed in a state of bondage to things little understood and often feared. We read in Homer how helpless were even kings before the play of wind and tide. They were often reading omens and seeking favors of the gods. Organized experience, scientific thought, taught man to seek in nature not a fairy realm of gods of wood and stream, but a world order with a rationality akin to mind. When he rose above myth and fancy, above a crude picture logic, to think in terms of

law, cause and effect, the unseen relations of things and their properties became controlling interests. The individual is seen in the light of the universal. Insight into natural law brought man a measure of freedom unthought of before. But even in Spinoza's time the conception of natural law was not universally accepted. The ignorant still carried amulets, and a powerful priesthood thundered its anathemas against the youth who were giving renewing ideas of natural science that were lifting humanity out of superstition and stagnation. Galileo was forced to recant, and Bruno was burned at the stake. A whole century passed before the mission of Spinoza was understood.

For Spinoza there is no conflict between mind and nature, religion and natural law. The natural world without and the spiritual world within are not hostile and intrinsically alien to one another, but coöperative expressions of one reality. The infinite variety and change we see in nature are the expression of divine law. Everything grows, or endures, according to the law of its own being. Nothing arises out of nothing or is the creature of chance.

Like our Puritan tradition, the medieval divines had put a gulf between spirit and matter, God and the world. They identified ethics not so much with rational conduct as with ceremonial observance and arbitrary prohibitions. The blessed life was represented as impossible without Divine Grace, and even then it assumed the character of a forced conventional existence in a lost world. Like the great humanist Socrates, Spinoza identified virtue not with a strained attempt to observe arbitrary commands blindly, but with a recognition of the fact that the origin of moral law lies in the spiritual nature of man himself. "To act absolutely in conformity with virtue," says Spinoza, "is nothing but acting according to the laws of our own proper nature."

Released from Bondage

SYNNOVE LARSEN BAASCH

II

The Farm Security Administration bought a tract of 6,700 acres of land, most of it good cotton land. The largest body of the land is centered around a cotton gin, valued at $25,000, which is the main asset of the property. A spur from the Cotton Belt Railroad reaches the gin. The purchase was made before Christmas, 1937.

No efforts were made to change the population already on the land. Any one who was living there at the time of the purchase and who was willing to work under the conditions stipulated by the government was welcome to remain. Fifty-nine white and 41 negro families are established there now. The land was divided into farms that gave a reasonable chance of yielding a living, ranging from 55 acres of very good soil up to 105 acres. The larger units will have to be worked more as livestock farms than as soil crop farms. These farms are leased to the individual families who in 1938 paid $50.00 rental each, plus one-fourth of the cotton crop.

On these farms are the new or the remodeled houses. A few of the older houses were good enough to be repaired and used; but most of them were torn down and replaced with cottages which were pre-fabricated on the construction ground near the cotton gin at a cost of less than $1,000 each. In this region of high ground-water level it was too expensive to build basements under the houses; instead they were set on cement piers above the ground, as is usual in this locality, and were given double flooring instead of the single, cracked, and swaying planks common in the sharecropper cabins of the neighborhood. The cement piers were capped with metal aprons against termites.

The houses measure 24 by 32 feet and contain five rooms: three bedrooms with recesses in the walls for clothes, a kitchen with cabinets above and below the sink and drainboard, and a living-dining room—the largest room in the house, 12 by 20 feet. All except one bedroom have cross ventilation. The roof is of handlaid shingles, and there are louvers on the gable ends. The walls are made of double boarding insulated with tar paper. There are two porches; the kitchen porch, 8 by 12 feet, is screened. All houses are painted white. In each unit is also a barn which was built at a cost of about $500, and which contains stable room for a pair of mules, cows, and calves; it has also a corncrib, a feedbin, and a chicken house. The barnyard is fenced in. Every farm has its own cement-sealed pump; there is good water thirty feet down, all over the project. As there are no basements, and as cellar dugouts are not feasible because of the high ground-water level, each farm has a small cement storage house around which the earth is banked for insulation. The construction of the buildings began in early March of 1938 and was completed on June 30, 1938.

The building program, by the construction division, was so carefully planned that it was possible for them to construct a complete farm—house, barn, food storage, sanitary privy, fenced farmyard and graveled driveways—all in one day. This was because the material had been pre-cut and assembled into panels at the central construction ground. This method actually made it possible for six carpenters to set up the frame of a house, walls, gables, and rafters, in 38 minutes.

When the land had been bought, the farmers on the project formed the LaForge Coöperative Association. Shares are one dollar each, and one man may have one share and one vote. The Association operates a general store and a cotton gin.

The store building was built of the same kind of panels that went into the houses, but is T-shaped, not rectangular, with storage space in the stem end, and salesroom in the main section. The store manager is employed and paid by the Association. All sales are strictly cash, and dividends are distributed at the end of the year.

The gin, as was said before, was already on the ground. The farmers are operating it together, and are using only certified cotton seed so that they are producing a high grade of cotton and expect an extra income from the sale of their good seed.

The farmers have derived material benefits from their coöperation in the purchase of farm implements and household goods. If each one had bought his implements by himself, he would have had to pay the market price; but where so much trade was to be considered, several manufacturers consented to bring their products to the project grounds, where the farmers had a chance to look closely at the various pieces of machinery before they recorded their first and second choice; and by buying together they got their implements at a great reduction in price. This, of course, would have been impossible were it not for the fine spirit of coöperation shown by the dealers. This same spirit of interest and helpfulness was also shown by the manufacturers of stoves and household goods; their wares were exhibited at the project to give all the farmers a chance to think and plan with their families before they made their choice, and again a saving was effected.

There is coöperative use, following coöperative buying, of machinery that is idle most of the year, but very necessary in the planting and harvest seasons. On the project, nine families own jointly a grain drill, a mower, a hay rake, and a stalk cutter; three families own jointly a combination corn and cotton planter, and a seven-foot disc harrow; and each farmer owns independently a walking plow, a lister, a light harrow, a cultivator, a wagon, and small garden implements and farmyard tools which are necessary the year-round.

Coöperative buying has brought to the farmers a striking illustration of the saving in having at their disposal the necessary farm implements at a minimum cost and depreciation for each individual farmer.

The idea of coöperation is carried over in a man's attitude to the soil, which till now has been the giver only, but which has received nothing in return. The farmer on the project is no longer being brought from one piece of land to another, toiling wherever he goes without interest and for meager returns; the returns may still be meager, but with the greater stability of living conditions, the farmer is expected to develop interest in the place which no longer is a mere shelter, but which now means home to him. You do not wreck your own home; you plan and work to improve it. The farmers could hardly wait last spring to have their farms assigned to them so that they might put in their gardens as early as possible; till now, there have been very few vegetable gardens on the cotton land. Trees and shrubs will be planted as soon as the people can spare the time from the fieldwork which no longer concerns cotton only. Each farmer has planted about 18 acres in cotton, and 18 acres in corn; but his other land was planted in oats, soybeans, peas, and lespedeza for pasture, and these crops are being plowed under to build up the soil. With the proper rotation of crops it is expected that the land will recover its fertility of earlier years.

To set the farmers on their feet, the government has made individual loans to the families, ranging from $370 to $1280, to be repaid during the first five years from crop incomes. There is, then, no cause for the farmers to consider their new farms a gift from the government; they will have to work as hard as ever to hold on to their chance. There is reason to believe that a few of the families will fail to coöperate, and will have to be replaced within the next year or two with some of the ten thousand applicants who have written the government, begging for an opening. But there will not be room on the 6,700 acres for many newcomers, for most of the resident farmers have accepted their chance with dignity and humility. They feel the importance of the task that is laid upon them; the officers of the Association have set an example by giving time and work liberally to their fellow members, and have shown a vision and an intelligence beyond anything expected.

The Southeast Missouri Farm Project, and the LaForge Coöperative Association are just beginning. They are an experiment, and faultfinders as well as believers must grant them time before assertions are made of failure or success. In time, they may answer some of the questions that come to mind when we consider the plight of the sharecroppers throughout the entire South.

Why should the poorest people in the country live on the richest land, and yet become ever poorer?

Can the land be made to support all in comfort, and what is the minimum acreage necessary for that purpose?

How can sharecropper and tenant families become independent? Through outright purchase of land on a government loan? Or through working more slowly, under leadership, toward a safer tenure?

What percent of the average sharecroppers can be made self-sustaining?

These are the questions which the government employes of the Farm Security Administration are asking.

The answers to them may help to determine future land policies in the United States; these answers will be found, not in the quality of the soil, but in the quality of the people who are tilling the soil.

[To be continued]

Lament for Vienna

Vienna, Vienna, your glory is gone;
The light of your dream-city's guttering wan;
Music's in exile; Art's in disgrace;
And Madness is billeted now in their place.

In coffee-houses, both Terror and Crime
Are pledging a toast to a murderous time.
Honor is coffined; Honor is dead;
Brown-shirted Death is living instead.

For all that the Jewish women may cry
In scrubbing the sidewalks with acid and lye,—
Not all of the tears that the Nazis have spilt
Can wash from the Nazis the stain of their guilt

So long as your sister-cities will sleep,
Vienna, Vienna, you still must weep. . . .

LOUIS GINSBERG.

The Study Table

A Tonic of Faith and Hope

THE GATEWAY TO THE MIDDLE AGES. *By Eleanor Shipley Duckett. 620 pp. New York: The Macmillan Company.* $5.00.

Before world peace is finally attained, it is evident that mankind must have arrived at a fair degree of equal civilization and uniform culture and ideals. So long as there are vast areas and multitudes outside the pale of social security and international law, those portions of the world which do enjoy such blessings will always be threatened by covetous invaders or by subtle primitivist influences of lawless lust and rapacity. The latter are almost as dangerous to an ordered civilization as the former, and often come first and weaken the stamina of the social structure so that the overt invaders make short work of overcoming it. Yet history shows that both these agencies of social decomposition lead eventually to a reinvigoration of society, just as a stagnant lake, muddied by a freshet, is clearer and more fecund than before, though its tranquil beauty has, for the time being, departed.

Such was the experience of the Roman Empire when the Goths, Huns, Franks, and other tribes, driven from the heart of Asia by the gradual dessication of once fertile plains, irrupted into its opulent but socially stratified provinces. For six centuries, 250 A. D. to 950 A. D., the invasion of barbarism went on, not only with violent warfare but through the infiltration of primitive lawlessness and immorality and sheer savagery of taste and manners. But at last the invaders, who by 950 A. D. included the Moslem Arabs and Saracens and the Norsemen, had blended their virile folkways with Graeco-Roman stock and law and art, and medieval Europe emerged.

What was to be saved of the old, what contributions came from the new, how gradually the assimilation took place, what the ensuing amalgam was likely to be, show most clearly in the ferment of the period from 450 A. D. to 650 A. D., and of this critical time Professor Duckett's "Gateway" is probably the most original, scholarly and interesting account yet published in this country. Though she is not professionally an historian but a teacher of Latin, her mastery of that language has enabled her to read copiously and accurately in all the sources and to produce a work well worthy of being compared with those of English writers such as Hodgkin, Dill, Glover, and our own American Henry Osborn Taylor.

It would at first seem that far too much of this book is given to a recital of the dreadful political turmoil of the centuries in question—warfare, constant and ruthless, massacre, treachery, and naked lust in high places. They remind us with ominous relevancy of the newsreels and headlines of today. But by a kind of spiritual homeopathy the accumulation of evil turns the horrified reader, in grateful relief, to the victories of saintliness and culture, and renders the book a veritable crescendo of optimism. The gentle Abbess Radegunde offsets to some extent the she-devil queens Brunhilde and Fredegunde; the Celtic missionaries and scholars Ninian, Finian, Clomgall who established the monasteries which produced the Gospels of Kell, Derry, and Lindesfarne counterbalance the villainous kings Chilperic and Chlotar; Columbanus, Benedict, and Gregory the Great, as well as the philosopher-statesmen, Cassiodorus and Boethius, redeem Humanity from the stigma of producing the Lombard anarchs. Yet it is too bad that this retrieving nobility is so often mottled by the most savage bigotry and credulity!

Professor Duckett, however, rightly estimates the importance of the latter in the picture of the age she is interpreting, and without misleading her readers as to what is dependable history and what but pious fancy, weaves in many a legend and archeological reference about this saint or that event. We are left, therefore, with a vivid realization of the function of even a bigoted and superstitious religious faith in sustaining the morale and maintaining moral standards amid terrible discouragement; with a deep conviction, also, of the value of communal life and labor for conserving and transmitting social and cultural gains of the past. Hence the high points of interest, of scholarship and of optimism are the descriptions (1) of the cloister of the "Vivarium" created for biblical study by the aged Cassiodorus on his estate in southern Italy; (2) of monastic life at Monte Cassino where, two thousand feet above the world, St. Benedict converted an ancient ruin, at once fortress and pagan temple, to the use of his monks and the development of his momentous Rule. The hour-by-hour narrative of life there is, we believe, unexcelled in recent historical writing. Whatever happened of perfidy and inhumanity in the world below the mountain, yet, by the river-pools of the "Vivarium" and high on the mountain top, there was actualized an ideal of human unity and harmony and happy coöperation for later ages to profit by. History thus written is not only a triumph of truth; it is a tonic for humanitarian faith and hope.

CHARLES LYTTLE

The Field

(*Continued from page* 146)

and America were to declare hostilities against Germany, they can bring no inner joy, no inner strength. The calculated violence of Hitler may even result in a general massacre of the Jews by way of his first answer to the declaration of such hostilities. But if the Jewish mind could be prepared for voluntary suffering, even the massacre I have imagined could be turned into a day of thanksgiving and joy that Jehovah had wrought deliverance of the race even at the hands of the tyrant. For to the God-fearing, death has no terror. It is a joyful sleep to be followed by a waking that would be all the more refreshing for the long sleep.

It is hardly necessary for me to point out, that it is easier for the Jews than for the Czechs to follow my prescription. And they have in the Indian Satyagraha campaign in South Africa an exact parallel. There the Indians occupied precisely the same place that the Jews occupy in Germany. The persecution had also a religious tinge. President Kruger used to say that the white Christians were the chosen of God, and Indians were inferior beings created to serve the whites. A fundamental clause in the Transvaal constitution was that there should be no equality between the whites and colored races including Asiatics. There, too, the Indians were consigned to ghettos described as locations. The other disabilities were almost of the same type as those of the Jews in Germany. The Indians, a mere handful, resorted to Satyagraha* without any backing from the

*Soul Force.

(*Continued on page* 159)

Correspondence

Answering Dr. Holmes

Editor of UNITY:

My thanks to you for the clarification. I followed your comments upon my letter with a real sense of relief and gratitude—right down to the last paragraph. But your statement in that last paragraph that our real difference is on the fundamental issue of pacifism calls for one last word.

My strictures on Chamberlain and my bewilderment over your position were from the standpoint of absolute pacifism. I do not criticize the Prime Minister for not having gone to war, but for attempting to make peace with his left hand as he promotes super-preparedness with his right, and, with both, following an utterly anti-democratic method.

It is just because I am a pacifist and one who regards UNITY as America's truest peace journal that I strongly wish to see your pacifist ideal and program kept uncompromisingly separate from non-peaceful approaches to peace.

The ideology seems to me of greater importance than any relief we might feel at war's postponement; lest, when the failure of Munich becomes manifest, it will be counted the failure of pacifism.

GEORGE M. GIBSON.

Chicago, Ill.

Field Article Commended

Editor of UNITY:

I cannot refrain from writing to you how much I enjoyed that article reprinted from the *Arbitrator* in the Field, "A Religion of Evolution," which is the most satisfying of any writing that I have read for some time. It is a most revolutionary article, inclusive and truly spiritual. I cannot speak of it too highly. It is the lump of yeast that should leaven the whole world. No, not tomorrow, nor next year, but some time—perhaps when the mind that conceived it shall have passed into dreamless sleep.

E. H. BARRETT.

Lansing, Michigan.

Glorifying Peace

Editor of UNITY:

The news of the world informs us every day of the progressive militarization of children in many nations. For a change, it is good to learn of the peace education of Swiss children.

I have just received a cover that the Zurich municipal school authorities distribute among the pupils of the city's schools for the protection of the municipally-owned school books.

On the front cover pungent peace quotations from the writings of nine great men and women are printed. Quoted are Martin Luther, Huldrych Zwingli, Heinrich Pestalozzi, Friedrich Schiller, Jeremias Gotthelf, Marie von Ebner-Eschenbach, Bertha von Suttner, Gerhart Hauptmann, Pope Pius XI. The back page is given entirely to a quotation from "Victor Berger (an American social economist)."

It would be desirable to use in all countries this method of glorifying peace instead of glorifying war to school children.

New York City.

ROSIKA SCHWIMMER.

Degenerate Christianity

Editor of UNITY:

Well, when will wonders cease? During these intensive, epochal times men are continually showing the measure of their minds. Recently we had a bishop of the Methodist Episcopal Church, from Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, voluntarily going before the infamous, humanity-baiting Dies Committee with a tale of woe, against helpless dependent human beings, holding an attitude of mind that could hardly be expected from the wayfaring man. What a contrast between the mind of the bishop and the mind of the lowly Nazarene! He says to the bishop, and to any one who claims to be his disciple: "Come unto me all ye who are weary and heavy laden and I will give you rest." Instead of obeying the voice of him whom he pretends to serve, this high Methodist dignitary seems to be lining up with the money-changers and mammon-servers.

Is it possible that the good (?) bishop has never read nor given heed to Matthew, 25th chapter, verses 31 to 46?

E. Stanley Jones certainly was right when he said: "A great many Christians get inoculated with a mild form of Christianity and are thus rendered immune from the real Christ kind of religion."

ISAAC F. BAKER.

El Monte, California.

The Field

(*Continued from page* 158)

world outside or the Indian Government. Indeed, the British officials tried to dissuade the Satyagrahis from their contemplated step. World opinion and the Indian Government came to their aid after eight years of fighting. And that, too, was by way of diplomatic pressure not of a threat of war.

But the Jews of Germany can offer Satyagraha under infinitely better auspices than the Indians of South Africa. The Jews are a compact, homogenous community in Germany. They are far more gifted than the Indians of South Africa. And they have organized world opinion behind them. I am convinced that if someone with courage and vision can arise among them to lead them in non-violent action, the winter of their despair can in the twinkling of an eye be turned into the summer of hope. And what has today become a degrading man-hunt can be turned into a calm and determined stand offered by unarmed men and women possessing the strength of suffering given to them by Jehovah. It will be then a truly religious resistance offered against the godless fury of dehumanized man. The German Jews will score a lasting victory over the German gentiles in the sense that they will have converted the latter to an appreciation of human dignity. They will have rendered service to fellow-Germans and proved their title to be the real Germans as against those who are today dragging, however unknowingly, the German name into the mire.

Gandhi, in *Harijan* (India).

The Declaration of Lima

The Governments of the American States declare:

First.—That they re-affirm their continental solidarity and their purpose to collaborate in the maintenance of principles upon which said solidarity is based;

Second.—That faithful to the above-mentioned principles and to their absolute sovereignty they re-affirm their decision to maintain them and defend them against all foreign intervention or activity that may threaten them;

Third.—And in case the peace, security, or territorial integrity of any American republic is thus threatened by acts of any nature that may impair them, they proclaim their common concern and their determination to make effective their solidarity, coördinating their respective sovereign wills by means of the procedure of consultation established by the conventions in force and by declarations of inter-American conferences, using measures that in each case circumstances may make advisable.

It is understood that the governments of the American republic will act independently in their individual capacities, recognizing fully their juridical equality as sovereign States.

Fourth.—That in order to facilitate the consultations established in this and other American peace instruments, the Ministers of Foreign Affairs of the American republics, when deemed desirable and at the initiative of any one of them, will meet in their several capitals by rotation and without protocolary character.

Each government may, under special circumstances or for special reasons, designate a representative as a substitute for its Minister of Foreign Affairs.

Fifth.—This Declaration shall be known as the Declaration of Lima.

FRIENDS OF JOHN HAYNES HOLMES
Have Joined in a Great Campaign to Raise
A FUND OF $250,000

To build for him a permanent Community Church in New York, to be erected at Park Avenue and 35th Street, New York City.

Knowing not sect, class, nation, or race, The Community Church has maintained for 114 years the spirit of tolerance so essential to our civilization. It is a free Church, supported entirely by voluntary contributions—does not sell or rent pews—levies no membership dues—has no endowment or wealthy patrons.

A Message from the Chairman of the Campaign Committee:

After seven long years of wandering through the city, The Community Church at last has its own property, and looks forward to the erection of a permanent edifice.

Its tradition is the tradition of democracy. In these clouded days, when our freedom is challenged from every side, its ideals and its work are sorely needed.

I believe that all liberal-minded Americans will want to make this new church possible, both for New York City and for the nation.

Peter Grimm.

The Community Church of New York
BUILDING FUND
51 East 42nd Street, New York, N. Y.

In consideration of my interest in The Community Church of New York, I hereby contribute to its Building Fund the sum of $.....

Signature..... Date.....

Address .....

.....

Draw checks to the order of COMMUNITY CHURCH BUILDING FUND. "Charitable and religious donations are exempt from income tax."

Community Church Campaign

Peter Grimm, former head of the Citizens Budget Committee is chairman of the executive committee of the Community Church campaign for $250,000. Vice-chairman is Mrs. Johanna M. Lindlof, member of the Board of Education of the City of New York, and chairman of the board of trustees of the Church.

Proceeds of the drive will be applied to the building of a new church edifice at Park Avenue and 35th Street, on the property of the former church which stood for many years at Park Avenue and 34th Street. More than $75,000 has already been raised, largely in pre-campaign contributions and pledges given on November 29 at a dinner celebrating the fifty-ninth birthday of John Haynes Holmes.

Mayor LaGuardia heads a list of well-known men and women prominent in many fields who will serve on the committee. Others include Albert Einstein, Helen Keller, Bishop Francis J. McConnell, Lillian D. Wald, Rabbi Stephen S. Wise, Dorothy Thompson, Norman Thomas, Herbert Bayard Swope, Thomas E. Dewey, Mrs. Dorothy Schiff Backer, Henry Bruere, the Rev. Dr. Frederick May Eliot, John Lovejoy Elliott, Sidney Hillman and B. W. Huebsch. Nathan Straus, the Rev. Dr. Frank Oliver Hall, Arthur H. Harlow, Jr., Salmon O. Levinson, the Rev. Dr. John Howland Lathrop, Julian W. Mack, George McAneny, Darwin J. Meserole, George E. Moesel, William Pickens, James P. Warbasso, Gladys Swarthout, M. Lincoln Schuster, Amos R. E. Pinchot, and John Nevin Sayre will also aid Mr. Grimm and Mrs. Lindlof as committee members.

Plans are already being made by members of the committee for a city-wide drive. A "New Home" rally on the day of the annual meeting, January 9, was held for members and friends of the church in its uptown headquarters at 530 West 110th Street. The congregation at present has no regular meeting place for all activities, Sunday services being held at Town Hall, 123 West 43rd Street, and administration being conducted from the 110th Street offices.